



## PATENT APPLICATION

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Hidenori KAWATA Group Art Unit: 2871

Application No.: 10/614,918 Examiner: J. Dudek

Filed: July 9, 2003 Docket No.: 116171

For: ELECTRO-OPTICAL APPARATUS AND ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT

## RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the September 29, 2004 Election of Species Requirement, Applicant provisionally elects Species 1, claims 1-9 and 13, with traverse. Currently, there are no generic claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that a thorough search of the two species does not place an undue burden on the Patent Office. As alleged by the Patent Office, Species 1 is directed to a multilayer junction-layer transit connected between the pixel-potential-side capacitor electrode, while Species 2 is directed to a monolayer junction-layer transit connected between the pixel-potential-side capacitor electrode. Thus, the search of the multilayer version should necessarily entail a search of the monolayer version of the junction-layer transit connected between the pixel-potential-side capacitor electrode.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the Election of Species Requirement is improper. According to MPEP §806.04(e), claims are definition of inventions and *are never* 

Application No. 10/614,918

species. Thus, the Patent Office's designation that Species 1 is claims 1-9 and 13, and

Species 2 is 10-12 and 14, is improper.

It is also respectfully submitted that the subject matter of all species is sufficiently

related that a thorough search for the subject matter of any one species would encompass a

search for the subject matter of the remaining species. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that

the search and examination of the entire application could be made without serious burden.

See MPEP §803 in which it is stated that "if the search and examination of an entire

application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits,

even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions" (emphasis added). It is

respectfully submitted that this policy should apply in the present application in order to avoid

unnecessary delay and expense to Applicant and duplicative examination by the Patent

Office.

Thus, withdrawal of the Election of Species Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lenna Leven

James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin

Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/hs

Date: October 28, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 19928

Alexandria, Virginia 22320

Telephone: (703) 836-6400

AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE

Deposit Account No. 15-0461

-2-